

REINVESTING IN YOUTH

A Regional Partnership

2005 Second Quarter Report

July 14, 2005

Dear Friends of Reinvesting in Youth:

We are pleased to provide you with this report on Reinvesting in Youth's (RIY) activities in the second quarter of 2005.

I. Reinvesting in Youth Mission

Reinvesting in Youth seeks to demonstrate that:

- 1) We can reduce juvenile and adult crime, reduce reliance on incarceration and save public monies by implementing evidence-based programs at sufficient scale and with precise enough targeting to lower the number of kids locked up.
- 2) We can change the paradigm by which we fund such programs through the recognition, capture, and reinvestment of the public dollar savings that result from closing down secure beds and avoiding the need for other "deep-end" expenditures. We can be budget neutral at a time of severe budget constraints, and we can eliminate the need for foundation funding within four years.
- 3) We can reduce the disproportional involvement of youth of color in our juvenile and adult justice systems by increasing the capacity of community-based agencies serving youth and families of color.
- 4) We can bridge the gaps that now separate different parts of what should be an integrated system – with particular emphasis on mental health, drug and alcohol treatment, juvenile justice and youth and family services.

II. Progress toward achieving the Reinvesting in Youth objectives

A. Expanded evidence-based intervention - using the juvenile justice system as the conduit and leverage point for change

Reinvesting in Youth continues to support the expansion of evidence based intervention services focused on youth and families at high risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system. They include:

Functional Family Therapy (6 therapists) - Family intervention that focuses primarily on families of youths aged 11-18 who are at risk for institutionalization. The duration of treatment generally ranges from 8-12 one-hour sessions for mild cases, and up to 26-30 hours of direct family contact in severely dysfunctional situations.

Multi-Systemic Therapy (6 therapists) - An intensive family- and-community-based intervention for chronic, violent, or substance abusing juvenile offenders, ages 12-17. MST targets the specific factors in each youth's and family's ecology (family, peer, school, neighborhood, support network) that are contributing to antisocial behavior. MST is typically delivered by master's level counselors with low caseloads and 24/7 availability.

Aggression Replacement Training (2 trainers) - A cognitive-behavioral, group training based intervention that has three components: anger control, skill-streaming behavior, and moral reasoning. Training is delivered in approximately 10 group sessions over 2-3 months.

Based on Juvenile Court data collection over the past several years, we are developing a clearer understanding of some of the challenges associated with implementation of these evidence-based programs. For example, during the course of this project the percentages of total youth served who are youth of color have been 42% for FFT, 30% for MST and 50% for ART. These percentages have been lower than anticipated, particularly for MST. We are focusing on the low rate of engagement for African American youth and families in MST. 40% of African American families that were referred to MST were subsequently engaged in the therapy, compared to 73% for all families. When we look at causes, we find that 33.3% of non-engagements for African American families were attributed to parents' refusal to participate. The comparable for White/Caucasian was 19.3%. On the other hand, African-American families that are engaged are just about as likely as White/Caucasian families to complete the therapy. The numbers involved are still too small to draw definitive conclusions, but we are exploring the reasons for these patterns, and we hope that we can produce information that is useful not only in King County but to MST programs nation-wide.

B. Reduce racial disparities in juvenile justice by building capacity within communities of color to address needs of youth

RIY seeks to reduce the disproportional involvement of youth of color in the juvenile justice system by strengthening the capacity of community based agencies that serve substantial numbers of youth of color. The strategy focuses on promising program evaluations, cultural competency training and "best practices" technical assistance.

♦ **Promising Program Evaluation** – Based on recently confirmed foundation funding commitments, RIY has been able to extend the JA & Associates contract through June 30, 2007, the end of the evaluation period. See Attachment 1 for the evaluation consultant Davis Ja's recent memorandum describing in greater detail the potential results which may be gained from this multi-site comparison evaluation.

♦ **Cultural Competency Assessment and Training** –

Because of strong interest expressed by community based agencies throughout King County, four new agencies began to receive Cultural Competency Assessment and Training from RIY in March 2005. Four more will start in July. The total cost of the cultural competency project for 14 agencies will be \$178,000.

Technical Assistance / Elements of Successful Programs – In addition to the technical assistance being provided through the promising program evaluation and cultural competency projects, the RIY 2003-2006 budget allocates \$217,000 for technical assistance to foster best practices in community based agencies serving youth of color.

The research-based “Elements of Successful Programs Guidebook” and accompanying assessment tool were completed under King County’s direction in May 2005. RIY foundation funds will play the central role in the delivery of the “Elements” package over the course of 2005-06. RIY is funding assessments, improvement plans and technical assistance for up to 16 community based agencies.

RIY and King County sponsored two very successful information sessions on the Guidebook for agencies throughout King County in early June 2005. A consultant team, Organizational Research Services, has been selected to coach and facilitate agencies in the Guidebook assessment process, and we are currently reviewing applications from agencies who wish to participate in this program. We have ten expect agency assessments to begin in September 2005. The assessments will lead to improvement plans, and RIY technical assistance will help implement those plans.

We also anticipate that the “Elements” assessment tool will provide a practical and affordable means by which funders in King County will in the future evaluate the practices of community based agencies and provide agencies with the guidance for continuous improvement.

C. Connect juvenile justice, chemical dependency, mental health and child welfare systems

In addition to RIY efforts to support system integration which have been previously described in these reports (involving juvenile justice / chemical dependency / mental health), RIY is currently exploring ways to support the “Systems Integration Project”, a collaborative effort of King County, the State Department of Social and Health Services and the Casey Family Program. This project seeks to promote greater coordination and integration of the juvenile justice and child welfare systems. These systems share many youth, and they face common challenges involving the disproportional involvement of youth of color.

D. Build regional partnership for juvenile justice reform

Over the next several months the Reinvesting in Youth Steering Committee, chaired by King County Prosecutor Norm Maleng, will be exploring future Steering Committee priorities and roles with respect to juvenile justice reform, given the fact that the Reinvesting in Youth project is currently scheduled to be completed in early 2007. The members of the Committee will be addressing the question whether the Steering Committee’s role should end at the same time or whether there are compelling reasons to extend into the future the Committee’s activities related to juvenile justice and youth services reform. See Attachment 2 for current Steering Committee membership.

E. Evaluation

In addition to its other evaluation activities, RIY is funding an evaluation that will i) provide a qualitative assessment of the extent to which major RIY systems change goals have been achieved and ii) identify” lessons learned” from RIY’s multiple initiatives. The consultant firm, Organizational Research Services, has been retained and implementation is underway. It will continue through June 30, 2007 with the most intensive work occurring in the second half of 2006.

III. Funding Sources and Partnerships / Sustainability Strategy

Attachment 3 shows the current project budget for 2003-2006 including major expenditure categories and a breakout of all revenue sources. Committed grant funds for

project implementation from the Gates, Allen, JEHT, Seattle, and Annie E. Casey foundations (\$2,343,918) are sufficient to support all but \$37,000 needed to complete budgeted RIY activities through the end of the project. The City of Seattle, King County, the Port of Seattle and 11 suburban cities have continued to fund the administrative costs of RIY.

IV. Conclusion

While there are many challenges still to be met by RIY, significant progress is being made on many fronts. Each of our activities is governed by our dual objectives: 1) to improve the lives of individual youth and families; and 2) to contribute to the development of *systems* that will sustain juvenile justice and youth service reforms after the Reinvesting in Youth project is complete.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Jim Street
Director, Reinvesting in Youth

Darryl Cook
Deputy Director, Reinvesting in Youth

Attachment 1

The RIY Promising Programs Multi-site Evaluation and Expected Results

Davis Y. Ja, Ph.D.

June 28, 2005

The multi-site evaluation design of the promising programs will produce results on several significant levels. These includes 1) outcomes based on individual youth changes over time, 2) program level changes, and 3) how these changes are linked to costs.

Individual Youth Changes

On this level, the difference between a single or two-site comparison design and a multi-site design is significant. With a multi-site design, we will have substantial numbers of youth involved, allowing us to “pool” the youth into a single group in order to achieve adequate power and determining whether youth involved in all of these programs will show any differences over time. Besides giving us more numbers to test whether youth can change, we can also analyze the data to determine the specific type of youth that can benefit (or not) from these types of programs. For instance, we can determine whether relative risks levels may influence outcomes for these programs as a whole. In addition, we will be able to determine whether ethnicity, gender, age and other demographic factors have any effect on whether these youth change or not. Furthermore, often as youth age developmentally, risk factors increase substantially. By having a larger subject pool, we can determine whether this phenomenon occurs and for which age groups. None of this is possible with a single site evaluation or a simple single site comparison with one other site.

Intermediate Outcomes: With a larger subject pool, given the common intermediate outcomes that were developed by all participating sites in their program logic models, we will be able to determine what intermediate outcomes were achieved by the youth as a whole in using both 6 and 12 months outcome assessment points. Again, we will also be able to “stratify” the data to determine whether ethnicity, risk factors, age, and gender plays a role with this cluster of youth in terms of reaching specific intermediate outcomes over time. Subsequently, we will be able to state whether youth change in terms of specific factors including all of the dynamic factors indicated in the Washington State Juvenile Court Assessment instrument (with the exception of criminal history changes for non-juvenile justice offenders). Some of these include: a) changes in school behavior and attitudes; b) changes in use of free time; c) changes in relationship with adults; d) living arrangements; e) alcohol and drug use; and f) antisocial behaviors. We also included a smaller set of additional measures that will allow us to determine whether youth change over e) levels of anxiety and depression, g) ethnic pride and identity as well as h) attitudes towards gangs.

Long-term outcomes: By using institutional outcomes such as involvement with juvenile justice systems, we can determine whether those who have previously offended will do so again for up to 18 months following enrollment into the RIY programs. For all youth including at risk youth, we can also ascertain whether they too will become involved with the juvenile justice system.

Program Level Changes

On a program level with each program providing a subject sample of at least 40-60, we can determine program level changes. In other words, we will be able to determine what programs seem to show greater youth changes at both intermediate outcomes and also for longer term institutional outcomes such as involvement with juvenile justice systems. We will be able to indicate how each program impacts youth at six, twelve and for some at eighteen months for both intermediate and long term outcomes.

On two additional levels, fidelity to model and service level, we will also be able to determine whether these factors play a significant role in youth outcomes particularly at 12 and possibly 18 months including retention rates. By fidelity, we plan to measure how closely each youth obtains the minimum set of interventions provided by each program. For service level, we will also analyze the data to determine whether changes in outcomes at both intermediate levels (see above intermediate factors for a list of the outcomes) are related to the intensity of the services the youth obtain (frequency and amount of services received).

Furthermore, we will be able to determine how each program contrasts with others in achieving these outcomes. For instance, several of the RIY programs are curriculum based, and we may decide to pool both curriculum based agencies to contrast to more intensive case management programs to determine how outcomes differ based on the type of intervention as well as the intensity of the interventions involved. It will also be interesting to determine how programs with minimal interventions such as our two comparison sites (WIA and Becca) contrast with each of the other sites. Will the site intervention effects be directly related to service intensity (amount of services) or some other factor such as the level of risks of the youth involved? We may also determine whether each site works better with at risk youth versus juvenile offenders based on the specific outcomes of each of these populations.

Ultimately, we will be able to indicate which of these programs work best with differing populations of youth (i.e., offender versus at risk), gender or age range. Ethnicity may be more difficult since some of the organizations have limited ethnic populations which will make it difficult to conclude whether ethnicity has any factor in each program's interventions. We will be able to conclude which programs work best in contrast to minimal programs such as the Becca program. We will also be able to contrast each program to the "evidenced based" practices as measured by TriWest. This evidence based program gives us an "evidenced-based practice" with which all the other programs could be contrasted.

Cost Analysis

Although a significant cost study is beyond the scope of our current evaluation, a contrast of costs and cost effectiveness is a central component to this evaluation. By factoring in cost per youth served, particularly youth success, we can begin to determine true impact of these programs. Since costs of each program vary dramatically including cost per youth served, a cost per youth served will be a critical value in contrasting each of these programs to each other. By factoring in costs and the number of youth successfully served, cost might be a major mitigating factor in understanding intervention efficacy.

Many evidenced based practices are expensive and involve significant levels of staff time for trainings. Cost ratios or cost per incremental change or success as defined by the outcome specific changes can help make relative differences across programs.

Summary

Although these are some of the potential findings and results that can occur from this study, some caution is important in that several programs have had difficulties in achieving the numbers necessary to have sufficient power for analysis. This may mitigate some of the findings from this study. However, it is also important to note that the advantages of this multi-site study are substantial and would certainly have outweighed the advantages of simply contrasting one agency versus another. The multi-site design in this study is feasible and probably the best alternative in understanding how differing interventions with somewhat similar populations (at risk youth) can be contrasted in order to determine efficacy over time.

REINVESTING IN YOUTH

Attachment 2 **Steering Committee Membership** **7/12/05**

Norm Maleng – King County Prosecutor; Steering Committee Chair

Terry Anderson – Councilmember, City of SeaTac

Robert Boruchowitz – President, Public Defender Association

Jeanne Burbidge – Mayor, City of Federal Way

Edith Chambers – Representative, Minority Executive Directors' Coalition

Patricia Clark – Presiding Judge, King County Juvenile Court

Marianna Conner – Region IV Dep. Administrator, Dept. of Social and Health Services

Ed Crawford – Kent Police Chief

Mary Lou Dickerson – Chair, State House Juvenile Justice Committee

Luke Esser – Member, State Senate

Don Felder – Citizen

Kathleen Harvey - Region Director, State Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration

Fred Jarrett – Member, State House of Representatives

Gil Kerlikowske – Seattle Police Chief

Alan Kiest – Lake Forest Park City Councilmember

Jeanne Kohl-Welles – Member, State Senate Human Services and Corrections Committee

Kathy Lambert – Member, King County Council Law, Safety & Human Services Committee

Conrad Lee – Bellevue City Councilmember

Lyman Legters – Casey Family Program

Greg Nickels – Mayor, City of Seattle

David Okimoto – United Way of King County

Tom Rasmussen –Chair, Seattle City Council Housing, Health and Human Services Cmte.

Ed Sterner – Representative, King County Community Networks Coalition

Ron Sims – King County Executive

Jeri White – King County Youth and Family Services Association

Attachment 3
REINVESTING IN YOUTH
Program Cash Flow: 2003 - 2006
7/12/2005

Dollars in Millions (Current Dollars)

	Year				Total
	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2003-06</u>
EXPENSES					
Intervention Services (1)	\$0.320	\$0.766	\$0.993	\$1.028	\$3.107
Capacity Building	\$0.005	\$0.172	\$0.475	\$0.251	\$0.903
Evaluation	\$0.030	\$0.114	\$0.060	\$0.107	\$0.311
Communications	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.007	\$0.007	\$0.014
Grants Management (2)	\$0.002	\$0.038	\$0.067	\$0.049	\$0.156
Program Management (3)	\$0.236	\$0.246	\$0.247	\$0.255	\$0.984
Program Development	\$0.021	\$0.005	\$0.005	\$0.005	\$0.036
State Legislation Match	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.120	\$0.120
Total Expenses	\$0.614	\$1.341	\$1.854	\$1.822	\$5.631
Cumulative Expenses Total	\$0.614	\$1.955	\$3.809	\$5.631	
REVENUES					
County/Cities/Port - RIY Admin.	\$0.221	\$0.236	\$0.236	\$0.244	\$0.937
County Funds - Programs	\$0.242	\$0.218	\$0.208	\$0.208	\$0.876
Medicaid	\$0.004	\$0.034	\$0.024	\$0.024	\$0.086
State Sentencing Alternatives	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.050	\$0.050	\$0.100
County Supplement	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.105	\$0.105	\$0.210
Local Govt. Realignment	\$0.042	\$0.169	\$0.171	\$0.138	\$0.520
Recaptured Savings (4)	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.086	\$0.316	\$0.402
U. of Washington / Prime Time	\$0.000	\$0.022	\$0.067	\$0.070	\$0.159
Govt. Revenues Subtotal	\$0.509	\$0.679	\$0.947	\$1.155	\$3.290
RIY / Foundations Total (5)	\$0.454	\$0.800	\$0.700	\$0.387	\$2.341
Total Revenues	\$0.963	\$1.479	\$1.647	\$1.542	\$5.631
Cumulative Revenues Total	\$0.963	\$2.442	\$4.089	\$5.631	

1. Intervention services include intensive, cost effective, proven intervention services for youth and families who are involved in the juvenile justice system and are at high risk of reoffending.

2. Grants Management equals 7.97% of the annual grants expended.

3. Program Management includes the existing RIY Executive Director and Deputy Director and administrative expenses that will continue to be funded by local government contributions.

4. Amount accruing to King County as the result of the State budget appropriation for the "Reinvesting in Youth" pilot program in 2005-06.

5. 2003 foundation revenues include \$88,918 of carryover from 2002.